

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on cannery 20, 2010 in which claims 1-34, 37-51 and 54-57 were rejected. With this response, claim 29 is amended; and claims 58-60 are added. Claims 1-34, 37-51 and 54-60 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Examiner Interview Summary

On April 20, 2010, a telephonic interview was held between Examiner Lanier and Applicants' attorney, Todd A. Rathe. The rejections of claims 1, 34 and 55-56 were discussed. Applicants noted that Hanaoka does not disclose (1) a processor that authorizes use of a RESOURCE based upon authorization INPUT from a prospective user (claim 1), (2) a controller that permits use of a PREDETERMINED PORTION of a resource based upon identified authorization data (claim 34) or (3) the system of claim 1 or 22, wherein the authorization granting interface identifies a PERSON authorized to use the RESOURCE.

In response to Applicants first and third points, the Examiner pointed to Paragraph [0078] of Hanaoka for the first time during prosecution of the present application. The Examiner contended that Paragraph [0078] of Hanaoka discloses authorizing use of ink in a cartridge based upon an authorization granting interface on the cartridge and the permit ID entered by the person. Applicants disagreed with the Examiner's contention. As will be shown below, the Examiner's contention with regard to what is disclosed by Paragraph [0078] of Hanaoka is incorrect.

In response to Applicants second point, the Examiner disagreed, contending that Hanaoka discloses authorization for use of a "predetermined portion" of the resource.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Lanier for the opportunity to discuss the rejections.

II. Rejection of claims 12, 26 and 29 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph

Sections 6-8 of the Office Action rejected claims 12, 26 and 29 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Section 7 rejected claims 12 and 26 alleging that it is unclear "how the print medium could remain coupled to an authorization granting interface once removed from the printer as required by claim 1."

In response, Applicants respectfully refer the Examiner's attention to Paragraph [0015] which describes an embodiment wherein an authorization interface 16 is formed along one or more side edges of a stack of print medium. Once the stack of print medium is removed from a printer, the authorization interface 16 remains with the print medium. Claims 12 and 26 are not indefinite and are indeed supported by Applicants' specification. The rejection of claims 12 and 26 should be withdrawn.

Section 8 of the Office Action rejected claim 29, noting that the limitation "the chamber" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 29 is amended to provide antecedent basis for the limitation "the chamber." Claim 29, as amended, overcomes the rejection. Given that no other rejections are made regarding each of claims 12, 26 and 29, claims 12, 26 and 29 are in condition for allowance.

III. Rejection of claims 1-11, 13-15, 18-25, 27, 28, 30, 33, 34, 37-51, 54 and 55 under 35 USC 102(e) based upon Hanaoka

Page 2 of the Office Action rejected claims 1-11, 13-15, 18-25, 27, 28, 30, 33, 34, 37-51, 54 and 55 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Hanaoka US Patent Publication 2006/0045595. For the reasons that follow, the rejection of Claims 1-11, 13-15, 18-25, 27, 28, 30, 33, 34, 37-51, 54 and 55 should be withdrawn.

A. Claims 1, 22 and 46

Claims 1 and 22 each recites an authorization granting interface coupled to a resource and "configured based upon authorized users of the resource." Claim 46 recites a method which

includes "coupling authorization data identifying authorized users of the resource to the resource." (Emphasis added)

Hanaoka fails to disclose an authorization granting interface coupled to a resource and "configured based upon authorized users of the resource" or a method which includes the step of "coupling authorization data identifying authorized users of the resource to the resource." In contrast, Hanaoka appears to merely disclose methods for managing rental printers. Hanaoka discloses a rental printer (not the print cartridge) which requires authorization for use of the rental printer. To prevent the renter from using inks that are not approved for use in the rental printer, Hanaoka further discloses a cartridge having a storage element that identifies "a delivery channel of the cartridge." (See Paragraph [0018]). As described in Paragraphs [0020] and [0021], the delivery channel information identifies HOW the cartridge was delivered to or obtained by the renter, i.e., direct sales, store sales etc. the "delivery channel" information on the cartridge does not identify and is not based upon AUTHORIZED USERS of the resource.

As noted above, during the Examiner Interview held on April 20, 2010, the Examiner attempted to rebut the above points by referring to Paragraph [0078] of Hanaoka for the first time during prosecution of the present application. The Examiner contended that Paragraph [0078] (below) of Hanaoka discloses authorizing use of ink in a cartridge based upon an authorization granting interface on the cartridge and the permit ID entered by the person.

E1. MODIFIED EXAMPLE 1

[0078] The system of the above embodiment executes both the authentication of the ink cartridge and the use permit screening with the use permit ID to determine approval or prohibition of the use of the printer 100. The approval or prohibition may be determined according to either one of the result of the authentication and the result of the use permit screening. In the structure of the above embodiment, the printer 100 executes the printing operation only with the dedicated ink cartridge 300 for the printer rental service. The printer 100 may be designed to execute the printing operation even with a conventional ink cartridge

available from any general store. A greater number of criteria may be set for the approval or prohibition of the use of the printer 100.

However, the Examiner's contention is incorrect. Paragraphs [0069]-[0074] of Hanaoka disclose a main embodiment wherein a system executes two separate authorization processes. First, the system determines whether the inserted cartridge is the "dedicated" cartridge for use on the rental printer by identifying the channel information stored on the cartridge. (Hanaoka, Paragraph [0071]. Second, the system determines whether the person attempting to use the printer itself is authorized to use the rental printer by comparing the permit ID stored in the printer to the permit ID received from the user. (Paragraphs [0072]-[0074]). As noted above by Applicants, the system of Hanaoka does not determine whether a person is authorized to use the ink in the cartridge of Hanaoka based upon what the person enters as his or her permit ID. This system of Hanaoka does not have a processor that is "configured to determine if a prospective user is authorized to use the resource based upon the authorization input and interaction with the granting interface coupled to the resource.

In recognition of this deficiency of the main embodiment of Hanaoka, the Examiner now attempts to rely on Paragraph [0078] of Hanaoka which discloses a "modified example". During the Examiner Interview, the Examiner contended that the first sentence of Paragraph [0078] of Hanaoka teaches a modified example wherein the use permit ID entered by the person is used to determine whether the ink cartridge is authentic.

However, the Examiner's contention seems to overlook the fact that the first sentence of Paragraph [0078] is NOT referring to the "modified example" described in Paragraph [0078]. In contrast, the first sentence of Paragraph [0078] excerpted below simply summarizes the main embodiment previously described by Hanaoka.

The system of **the above embodiment** executes both the authentication of the ink cartridge and the use permit screening

with the use permit ID to determine approval or prohibition of the use of the printer 100.

(Emphasis added). As correctly noted by this first sentence of Paragraph [0078], the main embodiment of Hanaoka performs each of the two above authentication processes: one to determine whether the cartridge is a dedicated cartridge for the rental printer and a second to determine whether the person is authorized to use the printer itself. This first sentence of Paragraph [0078] in no way discloses, as the Examiner contends, a modified example wherein the use permit ID entered by the person is used to determine whether the ink cartridge is authentic or "dedicated" for the rental printer. Once again, the permit ID entered by the person using the printer has nothing to do with whether the cartridge of Hanaoka is a dedicated cartridge for the rental printer.

The remaining portions of Paragraph [0078] of Hanaoka are even more clear in describing the "modified example" as one where:

The approval or prohibition may be determined according to either one of the result of the authentication and the result of the use permit screening.

(Emphasis added). Thus, the modification being described Paragraph [0078] is a modification wherein only one of the two authorization processes of the main embodiment are followed. According to one modification, the system only determines whether the ink cartridge is a dedicated ink cartridge. In other words, any person can use the rental printer, but he or she must use an ink cartridge "dedicated" for the rental printer. See the third sentence of Paragraph [0078] which specifically states:

In the structure of the above embodiment, the printer 100 executes the printing operation only with the dedicated ink cartridge 300 for the printer rental service.

According to another modification, this system only determines whether the person is authorized to use the rental printer using the entered "permit ID". In other words, any ink cartridge may be

utilized in the rental printer so long as the person using the printer is authorized. See the fourth sentence of Paragraph [0078] which specifically states:

The printer 100 may be designed to execute the printing operation even with a conventional ink cartridge available from any general store.

Thus, Paragraph [0078] provides no support for the Examiner's contention that paragraph [0078] discloses a system wherein the use permit ID entered by the person is used to determine whether the ink cartridge is an ink cartridge dedicated for the rental printer.

As previously concluded by Examiner Peeso, claims 1, 22 and 46 are patentably distinct over Hanaoka and are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 22 and 46 be withdrawn. Claims 4, 15, 16, 23-26, 30, 31, 33-33, and 47-51, depend from claims 1, 22 and 46 and overcome the rejection for at least the same reasons.

B. Claim 34

Claim 34 recites that the controller is configured to permit use of a predetermined portion of the resource by the device based upon identified authorization data associated with the cartridge.

Hanaoka fails to disclose an image-forming device having a controller that is configured to permit use of a predetermined portion of the resource by the device based upon identified authorization data associated with the cartridge. The Office Action is failed to articulate where Hanaoka allegedly discloses that the "delivery channel" information stored on the cartridge of Hanaoka permits use of a predetermined portion of the resource by the device. As those of ordinary skill in the art understand, a **"portion"** of something is less than all said something. In Hanaoka, the entire cartridge and ALL of its contents provide either a cartridge that is "dedicated" for the rental printer or is NOT "dedicated" for use on the rental printer. Either use of ALL the ink is authorized or use of NONE of the ink is authorized. Accordingly, claim 34

overcomes the rejection based upon Hanaoka. Claim 41, 42 and 44 depend from claim 34 and overcome the rejection for at least the same reasons.

C. Claims 54 and 55

Claims 54 and 55 depend from claims 1 and 22, respectively, and further recite that the authorization granting interface **identifies a person** who is authorized to use the resource.

Hanaoka fails to disclose the system or the control unit of claims there were one and 22, respectively, wherein the authorization granting interface coupled to the consumable resource identified a PERSON who is authorized to use the RESOURCE. As noted above with respect to the rejection of claim 1, Hanaoka merely discloses a cartridge having a storage element that identifies "a delivery channel of the cartridge." (See Paragraph [0018]). As described in Paragraphs [0020] and [0021], the delivery channel information identifies HOW the cartridge was delivered to or obtained by the renter, i.e., direct sales, store sales etc. the "delivery channel" information on the cartridge does not identify any **person** who is authorized to use the ink. The permit ID stored in the printer itself does NOT identify a person authorized to use the ink in a cartridge, but rather merely identifies as persons authorized to use the printer itself.

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 54 and 55 should be withdrawn.

IV. Added Claims

With this response, claims 58-60 are added. Claim 58-60 are believed to be patentably distinct over the prior art of record.

A. Claim 58

Claim 58 depend from claim 1 and further recite the processor is configured to allow limited non-zero use of the first consumable resource in the image forming device. Support for added claim 58 may be found in at least Paragraph [0017]. Thus, no new matter is believed to be added.

The prior art of record fails to disclose an authorization granting interface that includes a processor that is configured to allow limited use of the first consumable resource in the image forming device. For example, in Hanaoka, use of the print cartridge is all or nothing. Either the print cartridge is a "dedicated" print cartridge for use on the rental printer and full use is authorized or the print cartridge is not a "dedicated" print cartridge and no use of the print cartridge is permitted. Thus, claim 58 is presented for consideration and allowance.

B. Claim 59

Claim 59 depends from claim 1 and further recites that the processor is configured to prevent the prospective user from using the first consumable resource in the image forming device based on input of a first authorization input and interaction with the granting device by the first prospective user, wherein the processor is configured to allow the prospective user to use a second consumable resource in the image forming device based upon input of the first authorization input and interaction with the granting device by the first prospective user. Support for claim 59 may be found in least Paragraph [0016] which describes the provision of authorization interfaces 16 on consumable resources, wherein a prospective user may be authorized to use a first cartridge having a first authorization granting interface in a printer while at the same time may be prevented from using a second cartridge having a second authorization granting interface in the same printer. In other words, as understood by those of ordinary skill in the art, Applicants were in possession of the concept of two different print cartridges having different authorization granting interfaces, wherein a person might be authorized use one of the cartridges, but may not be authorized to use the other of the cartridges on the same printer. Thus, no new matter is believed to be added.

The prior art of record fails to disclose a processor that is configured to prevent the prospective user from using the first consumable resource in the image forming device based on input of a first authorization input and interaction with the granting device by the first prospective user, wherein the processor is configured to allow the prospective user to use a second consumable resource in the image forming device based upon input of the first

authorization input and interaction with the granting device by the first prospective user. For example, in Hanaoka, the same person can either use a printer or cannot use a printer. Hanaoka does not disclose a system wherein a person authorized to use a printer will be given or denied use of a print cartridge on the printer based upon authorization input. As noted above, the user are met ID has nothing to do with determination of whether a print cartridge is "dedicated" for a rental printer. Accordingly, claim 59 is presented for consideration and allowance.

C. Claim 60

Claim 60 depends from claim 34 and further recites that the predetermined portion is less than all of the resource contained in the cartridge. Support for claim 60 may be found in at least Paragraph [0017]. Thus, no new matter is believed to be added.

As noted above with respect to the rejection of claim 34, the prior to record fails to disclose a controller configured to permit use of a predetermined PORTION of a resource by device identified authorization data associated with the cartridge. Although seemingly redundant, claim 60 is amended to address the Examiners unique interpretation for the limitation "portion". Claim 60 is presented for consideration and allowance.

V. Conclusion

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-34, 37-51 and 54-60 are now pending in this application.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to

Atty. Dkt. No. 200312834-1

Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date April 20, 2010

By /Todd A. Rathe/

RATHE PATENT & IP LAW
Customer No. 22879
Telephone: (262) 478-9353
Facsimile: (262) 238-1469

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276